DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 533 CS 213 423

AUTHOR	Bailey, Charles-James N.
TITLE	Why More English Instruction Won't Mean Better Grammar. Grammar Series No. 1.
REPORT NO	ISBN-1-881309-01-0
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	42p.; Published by Orchid Land Publications.
AVAILABLE FROM	Orchid Land Publications, Kea'au, HI 96749-1416 ($2.60 stitched, including postage).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *English Instruction; *Grammar; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Instructional Improvement; *Language Usage; *Traditional Grammar
IDENTIFIERS	Grammaticality

ABSTRACT

Written for the educated reader cognizant of ordinary grammatical terminology or able to look it up in a dictionary, this booklet discusses why grammar seems so intractable. The booklet begins by offering two reasons why more diligent instruction in English grammar will not improve students' knowledge: (1) what is presented as English grammar bears little relation to the way fashionable young people speak and write; and (2) many analyses are wrong, or fail to capture fundamental principles that reveal the natural systematicity of English grammar. The booklet then presents an extended discussion of these topics using as examples a variety of grammatical rules and how those rules are and should be taught. The booklet concludes that teaching grammar using the principles discussed in the booklet would permit teachers to cover more ground, would yield a better understanding of the systematicity of grammar, and would therefore generate both greater rapport between taught and teacher and greater sympathy for the subject. An appendix discussing how certain grammatical concepts are used in the booklet and a corrigenda list are attached. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED347583

WHY MORE ENGLISH INSTRUCTION WON'T MEAN BETTER GRAMMAR

Charles-James N. Bailey

Grammar series no. 1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Charles-James N. Bailey
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ORCHID LAND PUBLICATIONS

CS213423

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PHOTOCOPYING. ***In the USA:*** This publication is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 27 Congress Street, Salem, MA 01970. Authorization to photocopy is granted for personal or internal use, including classroom anthologies, on condition of paying the appropriate fee directly to the CCC. Information on the fee can be obtained from the CCC by telephone (1+508+744-3350) or FAX (1+508+741-2318). ***In other countries:*** Permission to copy should be requested from Orchid Land Publications, POB 1416, Kea'au, Hawai'i, 96749, USA.; FAX 1+808+982-5603.

ISBN 1-881309-01-0

(Grammar Series ISBN 1-881309-00-2)

© 1992, Orchid Land Publications
Kea'au, HI 96749-1416, USA
FAX 1+808+982-5603

The logo of Orchid Land Publications
on the preceding page is protected by
© 1991, Orchid Land Publications

WHY MORE ENGLISH INSTRUCTION WON'T MEAN BETTER GRAMMAR

Charles-James N. Bailey

(i)

The attention given by the media to the deteriorating educational situation in the schools of most of the predominantly English-speaking countries has been widely echoed by concerned laypersons from the Prince of Wales to the parents in one's neighborhood and experts as well. But the prescribed and well-meant cure, to teach English grammar more diligently, cannot lead to the desired improvement of students' knowledge of English grammar for two simple reasons: (1) What is presented as English grammar bears little relation to the way fashionable young people speak and write (English differs from other languages in that the young set the fashions); and (2) many analyses are wrong, as this writing will show, and—what is worst of all—they fail to capture fundamental principles that would reveal the natural systematicity of English grammar. This is principally because they don't have in their arsenals a number of helpful models that would enable them to find and reveal that systematicity. The current, almost aleatoric picture of English grammar is *un*learnable by the ungifted; the gifted perceive how little worth it has and get turned off by it. The following pages attempt to bring out, for educated readers cognizant of ordinary grammatical terminology or able to look it up in a dictionary and able to grasp a few new but simple technical concepts, *why* grammar seems so intractable. Though most technical details are eschewed here, the reader may be assured that they are as convincing as I hope s/he will find the following exposition of the problem.

A brief glance at examples of **into** and at the problem of placing prepositions before relative and interrogative pronouns will plunge us into the subject at once. Readers should check what their favorite grammar has to say about contrasts between **in** and **into** like those illustrated in the following: **She put her money *in* her purse** but ***into* stocks and bonds**; **She fell *in* the hole,** but ***into* a frenzy** (or **swoon**); **When the ball flew *in* the window, he flew *into* a rage**; **The burglar broke *in* the house, and then he broke *into* a smile; They wrote it *in* the guest book**, but ***into* law**; and **I'll look *in* the garage** but ***into* those arrangements**. One is more likely to come across a partly imaginary rule relating to a stationary event *vs.* a change of place; but this misses the real nature of the difference,

for important categories of expressions, in real English usage. The prescription is often combined with a vague disclaimer to the effect that the rule is "often" (randomly?) disregarded—as though the data were simply a problem for the analysis rather than being counterexamples to it. It is little better with **between** and **among**. A false impression is conveyed that grammar is unsystematic—not the most systematic activity, except for mathematics, that human beings (whether they have high or not very high IQs) are capable of.

A strict adherence to the grammarians' rule for placing a preposition directly before its relative or interrogative pronoun object also leads to strange results. A sampling of these strange results includes **That's *in* what she's interested** and ***About* what is your book?** as well as **The question is *on* what her book is** (two descriptive grammatical rules are violated in this example) and **They're wondering about *on* what her speech will be** (three rules are violated here)—to say nothing of examples like ***To* what are they up?** The quite complex descriptive rules for putting a preposition before a relative or interrogative pronoun are evidently not known to the writers of grammars or the teachers of English.[1] They admit that speakers "often" say **who** for **whom**, but they don't list the conditions, grammatical or stylistic, governing the variants, let alone explain *why* the attested usages exist. All of this makes such treatments more than a little unhelpful. I'll take my hat off to the grammar that gives a convincing explanation (though it's not that difficult) for the difference between **the one he did it for** and **the one *for* whom it was únthinkable** (with **for** at the beginning of the clause). A similar explanation holds for the difference between **the matter** (or **danger**) **that they were involved *in*** and **a scenario *in* which the danger is great**, etc. Most of the rules involve greater structural conditioning than what the preceding difference (mainly semantic) calls for. Details on other aspects of the problem are available in the author's "Where English cannot put the preposition before a relative or interrogative pronoun" (in *The English reference grammar*, ed. G. Leitner [1986, Narr, pp. 156-177]; this analysis is improved on in the *Middigrammar* referred to in n. 1). Prepositions derived from participles (e.g. **during** and **except**) have to be clause-initial.

Current materials are more misleading than helpful. The fact is that when we hear **whom** in most contexts, we recognize that the speaker is either foreign or what linguists call a ***lame***—an unfashionable, bookish speaker who is not participating in (is out of touch with) the on-going creation of the English language. Can you imagine a native-speaking advertizer writing "Whom would you choose to build your car?" How many grammars bother to tell us that English **Who?** resembles its equivalents in the Romance languages in having (with one very circumscribed exception in fashionable English usage) but a single form for the different

case functions? These functions will be taken up later in this section. For the moment, let the discussion rest with the writer's expression of doubt that your favorite grammar will shed much light on the difference between "ergative" **who** in **the newspaper, *who* attacked the mayor** and "inert" **which** in **the newspaper, *which* is lying there on the table**.

Typical of the grammars' misunderstandings of grammatical forms and uses is their vague and unhelpful criterion for the use of the misnamed "present-perfect tense," viz. "relevance to the present." But can anyone really believe that a plain past form like **won** isn't relevant to the speaker's present wealth in **I'm rich now because I won the lottery yesterday**? (**Have won** is not grammatical here!) If it is not true that the past form **won** is *irrelevant* to the present, what then is the *defining* distinction between **won** and **have won**? Though ***perfect*** means "finished" and (in languages that have a perfect) indicates completed events, what could be easier to show than that the **have**-modalities in English convey just the contrary connotation? Compare **It has continued up till now**, **This has been standing here for years** (this cannot be said with any past form of German or French), **She hasn't finished yet**, and **He hasn't started yet**. A genuine perfect cannot have the progressive forms exhibited in **It has been continuing for ages**.

Illustrated in the preceding **have**-forms of English is the ***anterior*** modality (for this term, see the Appendix), neither a perfect nor a tense. Anteriors represent not what is past as such but what is prior to some reference time—past, present, or future. But the present-anteriors in the preceding examples would overlap the past if the present-anterior weren't further conditioned in a way that other anteriors are not. Whereas the past represents a moment or span of time whose end point is prior to now (e.g. **She won yesterday**, **He was winning at that time**, **They used to win every time**), the present-anterior spans a period of time whose end is *not* before now. (It may be "almost now," as in **He's just won**—which is so unsystematic as to be giving way to **He just won**, where the time of the event obviously ends before "now"). It's no wonder, given current sloppy treatments of these two forms of the English verb, that foreigners face such difficulties in learning to differentiate them.

An even worse example of analytical bankruptcy comes from a widely used British grammar; it illustrates two principal faults of many grammars. (I ignore the characterization of the misnamed "past-continuous tense" for a form that cannot even be used in an example so past and continuous as **Troy *was standing*** [or even ***used to stand***] **600 years**.) What we find is not a systematic characterization so much as a listing. The reader is asked to believe me when I say that the following statement really is found in the grammar in question as part of a list of uses of the form in question:

> [The past-continuous] can also be a way of showing your interest in the other person: **(What are you doing this evening?) I *was thinking* of going to the pictures.** . . . It is used to show a change of mind: **I *was going to stay* in this evening but I've decided to go out instead.**

Note that the first example hardly conveys the intended notion when the subject is, e.g., **she**. The latter is not even an example of the intended use, since it is not a past but a past-posterior; and any change of mind conveyed here is conveyed not by **was going to stay** but by the final clause! The vacuity and nugatory quality of such characterizations is underlined when one reflects that we can convey the same notions with similar words in any other so-called "tense"; e.g. **I'm thinking of going to the movies** or **I'll be thinking of going to the movies with you** and **I'd been going to stay in, but then I decided not to.** Such analyses manifest little professional competence. If adopted by a student, outlandish results would ensue. No intelligent native-speaker would accept the characterization.

Lists are atomistic—i.e. they lack the generalizations that lie at the heart of any proper analysis—and they describe instead of defining. Descriptions tell how a thing *resembles* other things, whereas definitions lay down how things *differ* from everything else that might be thought to resemble them. Descriptive lists can be helpful, but the fact is that a list is the antithesis of a *system*; for a system is a set of generalizations about the *interrelations* among its constituents. Such generalizations are expressed in rules or in some other manner.

As if our alleged "past-continuous tense" weren't in bad enough case in the grammar under scrutiny because of its listing (of irrelevancies) instead of offering a systematic characterization of the form's uses in terms of the whole English verb system, we find it encumbered with the very frequent and very serious shortcoming of grammars—the ERROR OF OVERT DISTRACTORS—viz. confusing the senses of the words used in one's examples with the import of whatever construct is under scrutiny. (The term ***distractors*** is Dwight Bolinger's.) The *words* may indicate a change of mind in the second example in our citation, but the *form as such* doesn't. In intonational studies, even among phonologists, this error is especially rife and is all too often combined with the defect of merely listing. Perhaps such defects are nowhere so evident as in the failure to capture the true generalizations governing the uses of the English comma.

The situation is no better with the analysis of the form that was a present tense in earlier English but is no longer one (the static mind has difficulty in recognizing change). That the current statuses of forms like **speaks** and **is speaking** are radically different is clear in the difference between timeless **speaks** and the real present, **is speaking**, in **She speaks**

English but right now she's speaking German. Given what current grammars say, the preceding is just as contradictory as saying, **He comes from Dallas but he's coming from Honolulu.** Contrast timeless **The child *eats* broccoli** with present **The child is eating broccoli** and timeless **The child *is* good** with present **The child is being good**. A headline like **Kissinger arrives Pretoria** can have **yesterday** or **tomorrow** added, but not **now** (except with the sense of "nowadays"). The forms, **speaks**, **comes**, **eats**, **is**, and **arrives** are *exochronous*—i.e. outside of real time.

Contrast timeless **And now Hamlet speaks to Ophelia** in describing the plot of the play with the real present used to describe an occurring stage production: **Now Hamlet's speaking to Ophelia.** When a clergyman at a wedding ritually says (what linguists call a ***performative***), **I now pronounce you husband and wife**, it is clear that **pronounce** is not the "present-simple tense" of the grammars: A member of the congregation would whisper to a partially deaf neighbor, **He*'s* now *pronouncing* them husband and wife**; but a television commentator—standing *outside of the time* of this scene like God and the Angels—would say, **Now he *pronounces* them husband and wife.** (See § ii for the use of **now** here.) If **makes** were a present in **This factory makes watches now**, said on Saturday night when the lights are out, it would make sense to contradict the statement with present **But it's *not* making watches now!** The absurdity of this sort of an exchange shows that to call **makes** a "present" is to board a flight bound for Cloudcuckooland.

Foreign-language translations of **She *hears* the bell now** and **He *speaks* Gullah** use the equivalent of our modal verb **can** (see the Appendix for this class of verbs). (When you tell the movers, **The file cabinet *goes* over there**, you are giving a direction, inferable from a form some of whose normal uses are virtually equivalent to **Let it go there**. But this is less grammatical than "pragmatic," as when you obliquely ask someone to close the window by asking, **Isn't it getting awfully cold in here?** The form is nevertheless already sufficiently modal to become a jussive [third-person imperative] in the not distant future.) One cannot give all of the reasons, especially the technical reasons (one involves what a linguist reader will know as Benveniste's Law) why the exochronous forms are not present tenses or even tenses at all. But in view of current presentations, it's no wonder that foreigners learning English get the forms, different as they are, crossed so easily. It is worth emphasizing that exochronous forms are "modes," not "tenses," in grammar. There are indications too numerous to be cited here, and in some instances too technical to list here, that the exochronous verb form of English is indeed an *irrealis mode*. Note the way the inflectional **-*s*** that characterizes this modality (though only in the third-person singular in most cultivated usages) conveys an "unreal" character in **Say*s* you!** and **Let*s***

you'n me do it!—with no apostrophe in **lets**.

If the grammars present a quixotic view of English verb forms, it is no better with the quasi-Romance case system of English: Grammars treat the English cases very countersystematically, unnaturally forcing them into a Latin, Greek, German, or Russian mould, whereas they are much closer to the Romance type. Except for the supposititious genitive case (on which more presently), only pronouns have case *forms* in English:

Subjective:	for subjects of finite verbs and some absolutes, including vocatives and participial absolutes
Complement:	for verb objects (indirect and direct), other absolutes, predicate complements, and object complements
Oblique:	objects of *foregrounded* prepositions (not postpositions [they're like prepositions, but they *follow* their objects])

The **pre-** of **prepositions** must be stressed in the preceding, since it is **who** rather than bookishly stilted **whom** that is usual in fashionable English before a postposition, as in **the one (that/who) I called on to speak**. This accords with a universal natural language principle proposed by J. H. Greenberg and since confirmed in many additional investigations: Postpositions are implied by object-verb order (just as prepositions are implied by the verb-object order of indicative main clauses).

In fashionable usage, **who?** is used even before a preposition that has not been moved up to the beginning of its clause; cf. the echo or reclamatory question, **You gave it to *who*?** with rising intonation. With pronouns other than **who**, the complement and oblique cases have the same form. But with interrogative **who?** and relative **who**, all of the case forms are alike (as with the word for **who?** in the Romance languages) except that **whom**[2] is used directly following a preposition that has been moved forward—which is infrequent in normal English. As is evident in the pleonasm, **the one *to* whom I did a favor *to*** (said by a BBC announcer) but representing a far from rare phenomenon that goes back to Malory), native-speakers of English don't find the fronting of the preposition very natural. Grammarians' prescriptions merely lead speakers of English to think that they "don't speak English very well"—an absurd notion. Grammarians have convinced Joe and Joan Blow that foreign-sounding Pygmalion English is better than fashionable English. Note, incidentally, that many (probably most) fashionable speakers cannot use the relative pronoun **who** for an *indirect* object except in restricted circumstances—i.e. not in **the one *who* I gave it** but, yes, in **the one *who* I persuaded to do it**.

English has so little feeling for case *forms* that even well-known

writers on grammar commit errors like **the one whom I thought was ready** and **to whomever did it**. Even the King James Bible reads: "But Whom say ye that I am?" Cultivated speakers constantly say **to she and I**. Typing this, I've just heard **to we humans** on US television. Cf. the BBC announcer's **Us humans get very attached to our pets**. Informal uses resembling those found in the Romance languages, so favored in the young Adrian Mole's diaries, abound: **My Father and me had a man-to-man talk**. Marilyn Monroe was made to look silly when the scriptwriters had her looking at a photograph and saying, "That's I!" rather than **That's me** in the Romance manner natural to English. Note that the English and Romance cases don't exhibit a local (dative) *vs.* directional (accusative) difference the way Germanic and Latin cases do. It has already been seen that change of place doesn't characterize the use of **into** with significant classes of expressions in English; it was an *ontological* change in the subject or object that characterized **into** in the main category of the examples above—not a *spatial* change.

His (**him** or **em** in some of the many daughter languages of English) can be regarded as equivalent to **him's**; note that genitival **its** was once spelled **it's**. There is persuasive evidence that the early genitive case no longer exists in English, the form **'s** now being a postposition. For one thing, we can't say **the King's daughter of England**, as Shakespeare did, or **the Lord's our God**; *we* have to say [**the Queen of England**]**'s daughter** and [**the Lord our God**]**'s**, just as we say [**someone else**]**'s**, [**the one to watch out for**]**'s nefarious plans**, [**the person who owned it**]**'s wishes**, and [**the one I talked to**]**'s daughter**. It would be absurd to treat **to's** in the last example as a genitive case. Further, the difference between **Joe's and Sue's books** and [**Joe and Sue**]**'s books** cannot be accounted for when only *words* with **'s** can exemplify an inflected case.

The treatment, then, of pronouns as well as verbs in current grammars leaves more than a little to be desired, if learning grammar is to be improved or even succeed at all. The verb forms found in nominal (object) purpose clauses like **He's *ensuring* that the noise *stops*** (compare **She *hopes* that the noise *will stop***, with a modal verb or also with *irrealis* exochronous ***stops***) are generally neglected. The Romance languages have a subjunctive mode in examples of this sort and in other contexts in which English has the exochronous modality or a modal verb. The difference between the immediately preceding examples and adverbial purpose clauses, as well as the difference between purpose and result clauses remains greatly neglected. Compare the modal verb **can** (or **will be able to**, or only exochronous **has**) in the purpose clause, **She's working hard so** (or **in order**) **that she can** (or **she'll be able to**) **have enough for that trip**, with unmarked **is going to be able to** in the corresponding result clause: **She's working hard, so she's going to be able to have enough for that trip**.

In no grammar that I've come across for sale have I ever found any indication of the English principle according to which a number of adverb pairs are distinguished by having or not having the ending **-ly**, with the endingless correlate functioning as an intensifier and the form ending in **-ly** understood literally. Contrast the items in the pairs, **very : verily**, **just : justly**, **real : really**, **sure : surely**, **pretty : prettily**, **awful : awfully**, **stark : starkly**, **clear : clearly**, **jolly : jollily**, **bloody (ruddy): bloodily (ruddily)**, and **right : right(ly)**. (**Quite**, **plenty**, and **plum** lack non-intensifier correlates, and **damn** is *sui generis*). In some rustic varieties, other pairs exist; e.g. **right smart : smartly**, **full : fully**, **hard : hardly**. The system is still developing. **Greatly** is an intensifier, but **hardly** is not; in cultivated varieties of English, **hardly** lacks the literal sense. **Highly**, **heavily**, **greatly**, and **wholly** do not conform to the pattern. (The difference in the adverbial pair, **late : lately**, is of a different order, as is that in **great : greatly**—except in **great big one**.) Grammarians' insisting on **-ly** with intensifiers other than **highly**, **heavily**, **wholly**, **fully**, and **greatly** exhibits as little understanding of the still developing system of English as do irrelevancies like their rejection of **till** in favor of **until**. How would **He was starkly mad** or **prettily tired** sound? There is a grammatical *and* semantic contrast between **He's sure** (or **real**) **tired out** and **He's surely** (or **really**) **tired out**, between **It was right out of the record books** and **It was rightly out of the record books**, and **They sailed clear to the end** and **They sailed clearly to the end**. Bright students get naturally turned off by the ineptitude of what gets taught; others get inferiority complexes.

Degrees on a scale of reality *vs.* modality (unreality; see the Appendix) are expressed with the verbids—infinitive, participles, and—at the "real" pole—gerund. But what sort of presentation of this scale is to be found in your favorite bedside grammar? The difference between **It's not easy *to be* the parent of a ten-year-old** and **It's not easy *being* the parent of a ten-year-old** receive *ad hoc* explanations, not explanations in terms of the overall system and with concepts like *irrealis* and factual categories. Such spurious explanations are notorious for committing the ERROR OF OVERT DISTRACTORS. The grammars hardly provide any systematic reason why **For them to remain** can't serve as the subject of a (non-futuritive) indicative predicate (e.g. **For them to remain is** [or **was**] **being misinterpreted**), though the infinitive construct is fine as the subject of a modal verb (e.g. **might be misinterpreted**), an exochronous predicate (e.g. **is a possibility**), or a posterior modality (e.g. **will be misinterpreted**)—all modal or "irrealis" predicates. The answer is to be found in the system of English verbs and verbids—which the grammars don't provide.

The complexity of the use of **of** in gerund and participial constructs is anything but clear in the grammars. Note that an adverb is

incompatible with **'s** and **of** and with a demonstrative or article, as in un-English **the** (or **a** or **Joe's**) ***quickly* rescuing *of* the swimmer**. Contrast acceptable **his quickly rescuing the swimmer** as well as **his** (or **the** or **a**) **quick rescuing of the swimmer**. Much the same applies to **by**: Un-English **the (swimmer's) *quickly* rescuing *by* the lifeguard** contrasts with **The quick rescuing of the swimmer by the lifeguard**, which is of course quite all right. On the other hand, a compound verb (one with an auxiliary verb) requires the adverb; **his *quick* having (been) rescued** is impossible, while **his having (been) *quickly* rescued** is good English. The system of these generalizations is simple enough to learn—if not to uncover. It should be obvious that English is using fewer infinitives where prepositions with gerunds are possible—a source of as many problems for foreigners as differences like **classic : classical** and **economic : economical** or the differences in **a Hawai'i firm : a Hawai'ian firm** and **West Germany : western Germany** (some German firms used to put "Western-Germany" [with a hyphen] on products).

The unmarked (non-special) and marked (special)[3] uses of genitival **'s** and **of** for subjective (ergative) and objective (inert) functions with gerunds and verby nouns (those directly derived from verbs like **rescue**, **transmission**, **transmittal**, etc.) could stand more clarification than the grammars offer. Why aren't we told, e.g. that **'s** and **of** systematically correlate, respectively, with ergative **who** and inert **which** referred to earlier? Cf. **the puppies *of* that stray dog *which* we almost ran into** with **Ipo's puppies** and **Ipo, *who* came along with me**. This new gender system is still developing and hasn't yet penetrated all parts of the grammar.

People generally substitute **lay** for intransitive **lie** "recline"—and, having gotten their knuckles rapped by the grammarians, overcorrect **lay** to transitive **lie**. The truth is that **lay** can be used as a "contraponent" (verbs active in form, passive in sense and therefore intransitive; these are derived from causative verbs): Intransitive **lay** is exactly parallel and presumably just as grammatical as saying **translates** (for **gets translated**) in **That book translates easily**, or **opened** (for **got opened** or **opened itself**) in **The door opened**. Languages lacking contraponents have to use passives or reflexives where English has contraponents. If the facts were accepted, life would be easier—and the overcorrection of **lay** to **lie** would cease.

An advanced grammar may distinguish *deontic* and *epistemic* uses of the modal verbs expressing necessity and possibility: epistemic uses indicate logical necessity and possibility, rather than real-world necessity and possibility. (Some grammarians get performatives confused with deontic use.) In **We must[4] leave now if we're not to be late** and **They may do it eventually**, we find epistemic **must** and **may**, while **You must do it** and permission-granting **You may do so** contain deontic **must** and **may**.

Even where these facts are presented, one will seldom if ever find them integrated into the overall system of modal verbs. It is incumbent on a grammar to mention other aspects of the semantic system of modals and semimodals like **hafta** and **'ve gotta** (not really modals); e.g. the authoritarian subcategorization that differentiates deontic **must** from deontic **hafta** and **'ve gotta**. Foreigners often come across with unintended rudeness in their general use of authoritarian-sounding deontic **must**—instead of **hafta** or **'ve gotta**.[5] The difference between the "moral" obligation of **should** or **ought (to)** (it is due to someone's will—command, promise, etc.) and the deontic necessity of **must** (not morally evaluative) ought to come in for its share of clarification in terms of the overall system. A grammar should point out that modals lack pasts (cf. **had to** for the past of deontic **must**), and that deontics also lack anteriors. (The exception of real-past **could** in negative, interrogative, and comparative environments and systematic exceptions like past uses of non-posterior presumptive, volitive, and characterizing **would** cannot be discussed here.)

Your grammar may or may not be sophisticated enough to mention the difference (intensively studied by syntacticians) between **hafta**[6] and **have to**, **'ve gotta** and **'ve got to**, **useta** and **used to**, and **be sposeta : be supposed to**. Note that the unelided item on the right in each of the foregoing pairs has the literal sense, whereas the elided item on the left constitutes a lexical word that has a quasimodal sense different from the literal meaning of the original combination. Native speakers have no trouble contrasting the structures of:[7]

What'd they hafta eat? *vs.* **What'd they have *e* to eat?**
What's she gotta eat? *vs.* **What's she got *e* to eat?**
What'd they useta light it with? *vs.* **What did they use *e* to light it with?**
What're they sposeta be doing? *vs.* **What're they supposed to be doing?**

What functions as the object of the inflected verb in the first three examples on the right; it is the object of dependent **eat** and **use** in the first three examples on the left. As single words, the verb forms on the left are, like modal verbs, followed by a short infinitive (one not markered by **to**); and they are not split up in good English—the way foreigners say **I have *now* to go.** One hears professors in Europe constantly saying **Joe was used to do the tests**, despite its century-old obsoleteness; a native-speaker might well respond to this (passive) statement, **Why'd they use *him* for that?** **We used to go** and **We were used to going** are both currently found; they differ in meaning, of course. **We used always to go**, with **useta** interrupted by an adverbial, is un-English because we can't split a single word with a modifier! Teaching this would be better than inventing spurious and pointless prescriptions like not splitting infinitives.

The foregoing account makes it possible to understand why **I have now to go** and **I've got now to go** sound so un-English, whereas

I've now got a lot to do sounds all right. When **have** is used without **got**, we get a contrast between the strangeness of the foreigner's **I haven't enough** and the native-speaker's **I don't have enough** or **I haven't got enough**. Of course, **I haven't done enough** (with *auxiliary* **have**) is fine. A reasonable grammar should explain that the full verb **have** is full-stressed (it may be unstressed before a full-stressed syllable, as in **I've no excuse** [Bolinger p.c.]) and takes **do** when negated or interrogated—just like any other full verb. Like other auxiliary verbs, **'ve** does not take **do**. Some of the differences between the two **have**s are less consistently found in British English—which explains its slightly greater preference for **'ve got** and its **had got** past. Unlike stressed **have** and **hafta**, **'ve got** and **'ve gotta** cannot function as the complementary infinitive of an auxiliary verb. Hence, **She would've gotta do that** is un-English.

Foreign teachers of English, doubtless because of the grammars available, are generally unaware of the two **have**s in English. Readers may wish to look up the uses of **have** in their favorite desktop grammar, as well as the pragmatic difference between **haven't** and **'ve not** or **won't've** and **'ll not've**. To be checked in your grammar also is the semantic difference, obvious to any native-speaker, between **Why can't she succeed?** and **How can she not succeed?** It should be instructive to note that the latter, perfectly good example of English violates the rule that foreigners learn—that **not** modifying a compound verb has to directly follow the auxiliary verb. The confusion arises out of the fact that **-n't** is considered a debased form of **not**, as though what's true of the one ought to be true of the other: Users of (monostylistic) standardized languages seldom understand polystylistic differentiation in good English.

That unstressed **of** and **'ve** drop their **v** before consonants should be mentioned in grammars; this phenomenon can be most efficiently gotten across with casual spellings like **sorta**, **lotsa**, **musta**, and **coulda**. Also worthy of inclusion would be some mention of the fact that **'ve** has a brief vowel following modal verbs and infinitival **to**, but not elsewhere unless a consonant precedes. Contrast **They've gone**, with no vowel before **'ve**, and **Can they've gone?** or **Are they to've done it?**—both of which have the vowel in question before **'ve**. These two bits of information are important, since contexts exist in which **'ve** can lack both the vowel and the **v** in good English and thus effectively vanish from the pronunciation entirely, so that **I've got** gets heard as **I got**. That some linguists aren't very aware of these details shouldn't excuse the purveyor of grammars from addressing them—and from refraining from any condemnation of **I got** as ungrammatical. What remains ungrammatical is **don't got** in **They don't got any**, though many cultivated speakers say, **They ('ve) got enough, don't they? Got** is obviously becoming a lexical verb in English, as it already has done in some of the various daughter

languages of English—e.g. Bislama.

Further information that a grammar ought to provide is that **'d** stands for **did** (rather than for just **had** or **would**) following interrogative pronouns, interrogative adverbs, and **so**; and that in the same environments **'s** stands for **does** (rather than just for **is** or **has**). Compare **Where'd they go? So'd I!** and **How's she expect to win?** Further relevant information is that the sound **d** becomes (with respect to its place of articulation) like a following consonant in predictable instances—e.g. **goobbye** for **goodbye**, **babminton** for **badminton**, **abmiral** for **admiral**, **goog grief** for **good grief**, and **brygroom** for **bridegroom.** The importance of this lies in the fact that after the **'d** in **'d been** and **'d better** has changed to **b**, the **bb** in **you'b been** and **you'b better** simplify (in normal allegro tempos) to one **b**, and the original **'d** effectively gets lost. As a result, **you'd better** is normally heard as **you better**. Since this result is rule-governed, systematic, and grammatical, there is nothing gained in denouncing it.

As the loss of **'d** is less tolerable in counterfactual hypothesis clauses like **If she'd been on time,** . . . , speakers tend to strengthen the auxiliary by doubling it here; this yields **If she'da** (or **If she hadda) been on time**—where "a" in **'da** or **hadda** stands for **v**-less but not vowelless **'ve**. The goal of this doubling (cf. the doubled anterior or past in given marked contexts in French and even German) is what W. Mayerthaler calls CONSTRUCTIONAL ICONISM: The more or less marked a category or construct is, the correspondingly more or less "markered" (see the Appendix) with perceptible material its outward form needs to be. In its very marked function as a counterfactual past, the past-anterior therefore calls for greater form; over the centuries (and even in the 1611 Bible), this desideratum has been satisfied by doubling auxiliary **had** to **had (ha)ve**. (One British playwright writes the unlikely "had have"; a North American would probably write "had of.") That the foregoing description of what is going on is correct is clear from the fact that the double past-anterior isn't found in writing, where "'d" cannot get lost. Once entirely natural processes like these are understood, grammar loses its pseudomystery.

Sometimes a grammar can usefully point out other pronunciation curiosities. For example, the vowel in **-ed** in not dropped after a full-stressed syllable when **-ly** or **-ness** follows, even though it is dropped otherwise; contrast **alleg'd** with **allegĕdly**, and compare **markĕdness** even for persons who say **mark'd** for the adjectival form.

Many teachers fall into the LAYPERSON'S TRAP—an error that arises out of lack of awareness that many rules come between the dictionary forms of words and actual utterances: These rules change the lexical forms in various ways. Teachers accept the regularity that the "d" in

explode and "t" in **democrat** change to sibilants in **explosion** and **democracy** because the spelling leaves them no choice. But what of the rule-governed deletion of "t" in **waste paper** and of "d" in **bandwidth**—or of "g" in **somethin'** and **movin'**? The idea that every letter (including "v" in **'ve**) should be pronounced, let alone pronounced as it is spelled in the dictionary, is not only wrong; it would produce absurd results if consistently followed—if, say, "s" didn't become "sh" in **horseshoe** as well as in **thish shear** for "this year" and **zh** in **Japanezhe zhen** for "Japanese yen." The foreigner's "s" for **sh** in **this year** sounds no less *mignard* than native-speaker "s" does in the verbs **associate** and **negotiate** and in **species** and the like. (On the other hand, the parallel **ch** in **pronunciation** is not liked by many.) The same English rules that jointly change "t" to "ch" in **nature** and "d" to "j" in **education** produce similar results also in **don'tchu** for "dont you" and **didja** for "did you." Note the change of "t" in **inert** and **military** to "sh" in **inertia** and **militia**. The relevant rule is dying out and no longer applies to new words like **patio** (contrast older **ratio**) and **Pontiac**. Another rule deletes "t" (except in Great Britain) in normal tempos in **winter** and **Atlanta**—but only in very rapid tempos in **Toronto**, because the final vowel is not unstressed.

Native-speakers of English make all of these changes without effort and unconsciously; the linguist's rules simply formalize what goes on. We can't say **That he's out to lunch seems to me**; an EXTRAPOSITION rule obligatorily creates ***It* seems to me that he's out to lunch**. Note that we can say *either* **That he's out to lunch seems obvious to me** or ***It* seems obvious to me that he's out to lunch**; the EXTRAPOSITION rule that moves the subject noun clause to the end, replacing it with place-holding **It**, is not obligatory with **seems** when it's followed by a predicate complement—in this example: **obvious**. This restriction doesn't apply at all to most expressions; e.g. **It happened** (or **is important**) **that she won**.

Does your handy desktop grammar tell you about the difference between the two past-habitual modalities illustrated in **She *would* sit there like that every day** (very marked) and **She *useta* sit there like that every day** (less marked)? It should tell you that the former signals a characterizing habit and fits into the English verb system in functioning as the past form of (non-posterior) characterizing **will** (heard in **She*'ll* say that every time you ask her**).

If the way "educated" people say "a dice" or "a pence" gives pause, their attempts to imitate Elizabethan English by hanging the third-person singular indicative ending, **-eth**, on verbs whose subjects are plural, first-person singular, or even second-person singular (where **-est** corresponds to **-eth**) evoke greater wonder. Supposedly educated people even use **-eth** with modal verbs; and I've even heard an example of **-eth** appended to a (second-person) imperative! What've the teachers missed?

It's a bit negligent of many grammars not to tell us where the infinitive is *not* markered by **to**: after modals and many auxiliaries (optionally in specifiable positions with **ought**) and optionally with **help**; and with some of the causatives—**let, have, make**, but not **cause** and **get**—in earlier English, not even with **make**. **To** optionally follows **except**, **than**, and **but**; e.g. **We wanted to do everything but (to) lose**. Here and in certain types of "cleft" sentences like **What they wanted to do was (to) win quickly**, **to** is much less likely in normal than in formal styles. Perception verbs that can take an infinitive usually take the short infinitive. But D. Bolinger has pointed out that there is a difference between **We saw him be obnoxious**, which represents an activity, and **We saw him *to* be obnoxious**, which represents a state. At the beginning of a clause, the long infinitive (preceded by the marker **to**) is regular; its subject here, if expressed, is preceded by the marker of an infinitival subject, **for**, as in ***For us* to win would be great**! Unlike a Germanic language, English uses **to** with subject and predicate-complement infinitives. When the infinitive construct is the object of the verb and *follows* it, **for** precedes the subjects of certain infinitives, but not all; see at the end of §iii.

English freely forms infinitival relative constructs (with the long infinitive; cf. **a person to watch out for**) and indirect questions (e.g. **I don't know who to discuss it with**). Such constructs have parallels in the Romance languages but are not Germanic. One must distinguish the subject of an infinitive from an infinitival construct used as the subject of a finite verb. In **For *them* to win quickly would be good**, **them** is the subject of the infinitive, and **to win** (with its subject and modifier) is the subject of the main predicate: **would be good**. Note that the whole nominal (i.e. noun-like) infinitive construct here is modified by an adjective, **good**, whereas the infinitive itself is modified by an adverb—**quickly**.

The use of **Here's**, **There's**, and **Where's** with plural predicates, which goes back to Shakespeare, is due to the difficulty of pronouncing **'re** after these words. This is evident in the fact that in inverted word order, **is** is abandoned in favor of **'re**; e.g. **'Re there many on hand?** (The usage with **'s** has now been extended to the interrogative adverb **How?** in the idiom, **How's tricks?** We don't say **How's they doin'?**)

Native-speaking readers have probably not often wondered about when **from where** is unacceptable and when this combination is acceptable. Compare acceptable **from where** in **the dock from where we departed** and in **They departed from where the boat was anchored** with examples in which **from where** is unacceptable: **From where did they leave?** and the indirect question—**He wondered from where they were**. But it's problem enough for foreigners. The answer is known and a grammar should deal with it; but is it expounded in the reader's favorite grammar? It is to be noted that the entire **where**-clause serves as the object of **from** in the

second of these four examples; but in the other examples, **where** itself is the object of **from**. **Where** begins a quasirelative clause in the acceptable first example, while it is interrogative in the unacceptable third and fourth examples. Even an interrogative **where** would be acceptable after **from** if the whole clause beginning with **where** were the object of **from**; examples of this are, however, rare and hard to find (but see below).

It is of little value to say that non-demonstrative **that** "often" gets deleted. Grammarians worth their salt give some hint of the circumstances for such optional choices. We don't delete **that** (unless **so** precedes) in purpose clauses, but we often do so in result clauses. When a **that**-clause comes at the beginning of the main clause—and therefore when it is a subject of the higher predicate—**that** is not deleted; and the same holds for predicate complements. We don't delete **that** introducing an appositive clause, usually not even when an appositive clause is extraposed, as in **It is interesting that he called in sick**. The **that**-clause in **the fact that we knew** can be an appositive or a relative clause; but in **the fact *e* we knew** (***e*** [for "empty"] represents the missing **that**), it can only be a relative. As often as not, we delete the relative pronoun **that** when it is *not* a subject (of a restrictive clause); many people can delete subject relative pronoun **that** only when its antecedent is preceded by **There's** or **It's**. When a nominal **that**-clause serves as the object of a verb of saying, thinking, or believing, the "complementizer," viz. **that**, is often omitted. We delete **that** after many adjectives (e.g. ***happy*** [**that**] **she was invited**), but not all: The grammar should have something to say regarding which classes of adjectives. And so on.

The treatment of amounts as singulars is mentioned by the better grammars; e.g. **Ten acres *is* a lot to own**, **Ten pounds *is* a lot for that to weigh**, **Ten miles *is* a long way**, and ***That* ten hours *was* wasted**. But to be accurate, several details are necessary, of which I mention two. Whereas **that ten dollars I lent you** refers to the amount, **those ten dollars** would refer to the selfsame banknotes that were lent and takes a plural predicate. When amounts are preceded by ordinal numbers, they are treated in the latter fashion, as in **The first ten miles *were* the hardest**.

Many grammars are anything but clear on the differences between (uncountable) mass nouns (like **sugar**), abstracts (like **love**), collectives (like **senate**), and generics—one use of which will be the unmarked use of any noun that is not an ordinary countable noun. Note that **statistics** can be either an abstract noun or the plural of an abstract noun, though abstract nouns more often become concrete when they're pluralized (e.g. **beauties**). The plurals of hostile animals or tribes are endingless; contrast **He shot three bear** vs. **There's three bear*s* in this pen**. Collectives and generics can be pluralized as such. But when mass nouns occur in the plural (e.g. **sugars**, **salts**, **fruits**, **fishes**, and **acids**), they refer to kinds or to

orders/shipments/containers of the item in question. British waiters can refer to customers as "the fishes or trouts, the steak," etc. Some singular nouns ending in **-ics** that refer to abstract disciplines can be singularized, in which case they refer to trends, schools, or kinds of teachings on the subject; e.g. **Kant's ethic** and **della Croce's esthetic**. That **sweet** and **ending** can be true nouns—not **sweet** *e* and a gerund, respectively—is shown by the fact that they can be counted; cf. plural **sweets** and **endings**.

There remain for comment also epicene **them** for "her or him," **their(s)** for "his or her(s)," and the recent **themself** for "herself or himself," unwisely condemned by grammarians despite use by the most fashionable speakers, trained announcers, etc. It should be noted that **s/he** is (roughly speaking) preferred to **they** when not preceded in its own or a preceding sentence by a form of epicene **they** or by words (mainly quantifiers) that create the need for an epicene pronoun; e.g. **Everybody should leave what *they*'ve brought on the table**. We refer to a person of unknown sex (e.g. "the applicant" or "the reader") as **s/he**.

What schools and universities need is genuine English grammar, not spurious and pale reflections, or rather distortions, of it. People want to speak non-lamely, not like a(n outdated) book! How can anyone deny that it is indefensible to waste students' time on the misapplied detritus of classical grammar now on offer? Think of wasteful trivia in grammars like recommending the almost unpronounceable **used not to** (**used to not** would be easier) in preference to fashionable **didn't use to**. Why not **use(d)n't**? Where do the putative rules come from? There may be useful distinctions between **nearly** and **almost**, between **continuous** and **continual** or **sensuous** and **sensual**, and between **further** and **farther**; but insisting on them while neglecting vastly more important matters flies in the face of good sense. Even more justified attempts to discourage **less** for **fewer** seem doomed to frustration in fashionable usage. And the way the uses of **like** and **as** are mangled in the grammars leaves students totally confused.

While it is true that the better grammars today are made from corpuses—collections of tapes of real data—these are valuable only when used in the right spirit; they can never cover all of the types of possible usage, but that's what's wanted. We are seldom if ever likely to find in a corpus an indirect question introduced with **from where** that has the specific structure of **from** belonging to the main clause and **where** belonging to the subordinate clause. To check the analytical prediction that such would be grammatical, we have to turn elsewhere, viz. to our knowledge that **He asked about everything from *a* to *z*, *from where they* vacationed to where they ate on nights out** is all right—in contrast with **He wondered from where they were**, which is un-English. As linguists say, grammars (like the brain) are finite; but the *outputs* of a finite set of grammatical rules and vocabulary items are transfinite.

What is most strikingly lacking in current grammars is the concept of a system. There is not enough space here to demonstrate this in detail, but an example from the temporal categories of the English verb will help to show what is at issue. First, there are several indications that English doesn't have a future but rather a posterior modality whose temporal range is *relative* futurity—*later than* a past, present, or future reference time. It is the mirror-image of the anteriors. There are past-posteriors like **I *was going to* do it later** and **I thought you *would* do it later** and future-posteriors like **We*'ll be going to* do it after they've arrived.** Secondly, as various linguists have pointed out, **now**[8] can be used with any of the nine posterior forms of English; e.g. **I'm now gonna**[9] **get the chance I wanted**; **I'll win it now**; **According to the new schedule, the patient gets that medicine tomorrow now; Now he'll be leaving tomorrow**; **It's now to leave tomorrow**; **It's about to leave now**; etc. These facts, and the compound nature of all but one of the posteriors point clearly to the conclusion that these verb forms are ***posteriors***; they are not inflected futures, as in some languages. Discussions of the nine posteriors in grammatical work have, by the way, fallen victim to the ERROR OF OVERT DISTRACTORS with deplorable regularity.

Modal or *irrealis* categories like the posterior, anterior, and exochronous modalities as well as modal verbs, imperatives, and verbids are alike in various other ways. For example, anteriors with **have** are found instead of a past in such marked categories: **They *had* left by the time I got there**, **She *has* always left by the time I get there**, and **By tomorrow, he's to*'ve* left**. (Exceptions like the very restricted real-past use of the modal verbs, **could** and **would**, were alluded to in the preceding section.) In contrast with the exclusion of pasts in marked categories, *indicative* past forms are, where possible, preferred to past-anteriors in English. Thus, **I said that in chapter four** is coming to sound more natural than **I've said that in chapter four**. Even **He just did it a moment ago** is coming to be preferred (not illogically, seeing that the time frame of the event doesn't extend right up to the present) to **He's just done it**.

It's not for nothing (in terms of the system) that the **have**-anterior and **be going to** posterior go with the three marked temporal categories—exochronous, anterior, and posterior. Past-anterior-posteriors exist (e.g. **had been going to do**), as do past-posterior-anteriors (e.g. **was going to've done**). Modal anterior-posteriors can be illustrated with **should've been going to do**; and anterior-posterior durative participles can be illustrated with **having been going to attend**. Readers can easily invent their own present-posterior-anteriors.

Members of the class of modal categories (the subset of marked temporal categories and that of negation, interrogation, and comparison) not only agree in the ways already mentioned; they also agree in reversing the proces uality of the **be**-passive and the **get**-passive (as well as causative **have** and causative **get**): Whichever aspectuality a given passive has in unmarked present indicatives and past indicatives will be the opposite of the aspectuality the form has in marked categories (see §iii).

The main point in all of this is that the forms of the verb constitute a tight ***system***, one that goes unrecognized in the grammars. The modal subcategories belong *together* in the *system* of English grammar—and cannot be understood when one does not class them together as a marked (sub)category. It should be clear that the past-, present-, and future-anteriors, the past-, present- and future-posteriors, and the exochronous modality are not properly "tenses" at all! But misconceptions of grammarians represented by such terminological solecisms are nothing compared with the non-rules that get taught and the real descriptive rules that never get mentioned. Without an adequate system, details are hard to learn and harder to remember. Current grammars leak too much for any plumber to repair them. What they require is radical rethinking. What could be learned without grave difficulty (and has been so learned when presented as a system) appears in current grammars as a hard-to-scale mountain obscured by mist and fog.

Still, a grammatical system is rather involved. One complicating factor is the concept of markedness already brought in here and there. Contrast **He's no teacher** with **He isn't a teacher**, where the former, marked version is said only for someone who *is* a teacher. The details aren't as simple as one might like in some instances. But here, marked **no** calls for the marked or special interpretation, "He isn't a very competent teacher." It's the other way around with the marked category of comparatives; thus, **no happier** is *less* marked than **not any happier**, which strikes the ear as more emphatic. With comparatives having a plus or ameliorative significance—e.g. **They're no better 'n us**—**no** invites a special interpretation, well known to native-speakers. This example illustrates but a small area of a large subject—but one without which no grammar can be complete, or even rational.

After what has been said, it's no wonder that students don't learn English grammar, which hasn't vanished from the curriculum for no reason. Who can learn pronominal case forms and verbs that have been transmogrified into an unsuitable alien mould? Even the most diligent students will end up like the teacher of several decades' experience who told me that he'd never understand the English verb. The answer lies in making the subject rational and systematic. Until then, the situation won't be improved very much by more-diligent teaching of more of the same.

If the terminology and analyses of the grammars are inadequate, so is their failure to employ useful analytical techniques that make the object of interest more rational and systematic. One of these is an adaptation of the old idea of recognizing the omission or deletion of an item whose assumed presence makes otherwise opaque grammatical phenomena transparent and intelligible. The formal means for doing this is to write ***e*** for a recoverable empty form. (In current Chomskian thought, empty forms have evolved rather differently from the kind illustrated here.) Although there are more than a score of uses of the sort discussed here, only a few illustrations can be given in the space available.

When we say **They walked *e* three hours** (or **miles**), **We did it *e* their way**, and **He listened *e* all ears**, the ***e*** stands for missing prepositions—**for**, **in**, and **with**, respectively. The analysis with ***e*** shows that it is not **hours**, **way**, or **ears** that is adverbial, as most grammars would have it, but the prepositional phrases—***e* three hours**, ***e* their way**, and ***e* all ears**. There's nothing novel in prepositional phrases functioning adverbially; *nothing is added* to normal grammatical apparatus when we opt for this analysis. A bonus is gained in obviating the obstacle to rational grammatical analysis that results from postulating undefinable entities like "adverbial nouns." This sort of thing clutters up the grammars, destroys the rationality of the subject in favor of *ad hoc* analyses, proliferates what has to be learned, and of course presents students with items that are very hard to learn—or, more likely, just baffling.

With an empty form standing for "a short time ago," we can explain why **I just did it *e*** accords with the English verb system. **I already did it** and **I didn't do it yet** are more problematic, though it is clear that they are gaining status and will soon become acceptable in fashionable usage. While **not-yet**ness would seem to require an anterior time frame (the negative state lasts right up to the present and beyond), English is coming to treat the time frame of events referred to with **already** simply as finished (past) rather than as spanning "past time up till now" (anterior).

Treating so-called "substantival adjectives" like **the good** as real adjectives plus the empty form (for **one** or **ones**) eliminates this indefinable and indeed incoherent category of needlessly burdensome things to learn. Without empty forms bearing the abstract analytical feature of singular **one** or plural **ones** (informally indicated here with **s** or **p** subscripted to ***e***), there's no coherent or systematic way to account for a sentence like **The general good e_s is what the good e_p seek** with singular **is** after ***e*** = "abstract thing" and plural **seek** after ***e*** = "people."

We can similarly eliminate the spurious category of "determiner *pronouns*" like **these**, **that**, **many**, **some**, and the like; cf. the example,

each ***e***, in the preceding paragraph, and note that **none** = **no one**. Is there independent motivation for this analysis—something to show that it's no more than a convenient *ad hoc* artifice? Treating **many** as a pronoun, how could we explain that it is modified by an adverb, as in **very many**? With obvious pronouns, we find adjectives (in reversed order): **nothing better** and **something strange**. A nominal or substantive word would be modified by **no** rather than adverbial **not** in **not many** ***e***. When so-called pronominal **many** is taken to be adjectival—i.e. an adjective plus ***e***—the artifact problem of its being modified by an adverb simply evaporates.

Given an analysis with ***e***, it can be theorized why **his** in **his** ***e*** (where ***e*** stands for **one** or **ones**) is stressed, since normally unstressed personal pronouns like **his**, auxiliary verbs (except those ending in **-n't**), and the infinitive marker **to** have to receive at least mid-stress before ***e***. Thus, normal **hafta** becomes **have to** in **They did it, although they didn't have to** ***e***; here, ***e*** = "do it." With stressed "pronominal" **his** ***e***, contrast normally unstressed **his** in **his things**. It's clear enough that, just as **mine** is **my** ***e***, so orthotonic and allegedly pronominal **his** is, from the analytical point of view, really the premodifier **his** plus ***e***. Since **my** = **me's**, it follows that **mine** is **me's** ***e***, quite parallel with **the doctor's** ***e*** (where ***e*** = "place"). This analysis offers a means for understanding why **mine's** (i.e. **mine** ***e's***), **this's** (i.e. **this** ***e's***), and **many's** (i.e. **many** ***e's***) are non-existent; but **each's** (i.e. **each** ***e's***) seems almost acceptable.

Consider the Q **of** N" AGREEMENT rule that makes English verbs agree in number with the nominal that follows **of** in a prepositional phrase that depends on (and normally follows) quantifying premodifiers (other than **one** and **single**) when they function as the subject of a finite verb. In **A ton of apples have arrived**, plural **have** agrees with **apples**, not with the literal subject—the quantifying premodifier **ton**. Observe also that we say **Lots of mail has arrived**, with singular **has** agreeing with the singular object of preposition **of** (viz. **mail**), not with the quantifier—**lots**. We say, **A lot of apples have arrived**—in which plural **have** agrees with the plural object of the preposition (viz. **apples**); the verb doesn't agree with singular **a lot**. But when **lots** and **a lot** are not quantifiers (i.e. when they are normal nouns) it is otherwise: **(Several) lots of mail** ***have*** **arrived** and **A (second) lot of apples** ***has*** **arrived.** But is the verb singular or plural when the prepositional phrase with **of** is absent? The subject may not be explained in sufficient detail or with sufficient clarity in your grammar because of the lack of the empty form in the grammarian's tool kit. Without an ***e*** marked for the number of the omitted or deleted item, we couldn't say that, or why, **Lots** e_s **has arrived** and **A lot** e_p **have arrived** are good English. (It should be pointed out that we sometimes used marked agreement in apparent violation of the Q **of** N" rule; this is done to make a special point, as

in: **I assure you that a pair of guinea pigs *was quite sufficient* for our experiment**; **were** would be the usual verb here.)

The empty form can help the grammarian obviate exceptions in order to make the grammar neater—more rational. Take the rule that the only prepositions permitting infinitives and **that**-clauses as their objects are **except**, **than**, and **but**. It has one exception: **in** can take a **that**-clause. But if in an example like **She's lucky in *e* that she's gained more sympathy than if she'd won** the empty form stands for "respect to the fact," the exception disappears: The **that**-clause now functions as an appositive to the "understood" word—**fact**. This analysis also automatically accounts for the usual "factive" (factual) sense of **in *e* that** expressions. It would be naïve to argue that the recoverable empty form is an unjustified "trick" of the grammarians; but even if it were, the clarity it sheds on grammar couldn't be gainsaid. The recoverable empty form has the principled motivations that linguists (except the most positivistic of them, and they are few and unfashionable) require and approve of.

One of the modern restructurings of the old subjunctive that have absorbed and expunged it from English is **should**-DELETION, as in **It was important that she *e* not remain there**. If we frighten students with a spurious "subjunctive" instead of offering them this rational analysis (with deleted **should** before **not remain**), we then have to add to their worries a number of otiose exceptions to otherwise general patterns: (1) the absence of expected **do** with a negated (non-auxiliary) finite verb; (2) the violation of the SEQUENCE-OF-VERB-FORM PRINCIPLE in restrictive clauses (unlike Latin, English does not have time-sequencing); (3) the absence of inflectional **-s**, which would otherwise attach to non-past **remain** when it goes with a third-person singular subject. Also to be clarified would be (4) the occasional presence of **should** in such examples. With **should**-DELETION and the resulting ***e***, all of these phenomena are *automatically* accounted for. (This particular use of **should** is found with expressions of volition and necessity and those of propriety and importance.) Best of all, we avoid frightening students with a treacherous and recondite item—the "subjunctive." The three unneeded exceptions that obfuscate what a rational analysis clarifies is a cross that some authors of grammars seem willing to bear; but intelligent students will be more inclined to regard such a murky, hard-to-pin-down, and unlearnable thing as an English "subjunctive" as reeking of obcurantism and worse.

In **should**-DELETION, we see, besides ***e***, an example of something apparently unknown to grammarians—viz. a processual modality. English has seven processual modalities; all but one are *irrealis*. The TEMPORAL THROW-BACK is one that deserves mention in this connection. To begin with, assertiveness is reduced by changing the time to the next-earlier one (the exochronous modality stands "between" past and future) in order

to indicate non-assertiveness; note the reduced assertiveness of **I wanted to leave tomorrow**, and compare the agent's **When did you wish to leave, Madam?** Here, non-past **want** and **do** would be less polite. When this phenomenon occurs in a past or present hypothesis clause (**if**-clause), it creates counterfactual force; as in **I wish it was/were finished, It's time it was/were finished**. We change the neutral past of **If she was ready** to the past-anterior in **If she *had been* ready** in order to make it past-counterfactual. Similarly, we change present **If he isn't still waiting** to past **If he *wasn't/weren't* still waiting** to form a present-counterfactual. In the future, the force is doubtful or counterexpectative, as in **If they built** (or **should build** or **were to build**) **it there next year** (cf. n. 11).

Readers will doubtless recall the respelling of ***was*** to ***were*** in present counterfactuals, optional in normal discourse except as noted below. No other verb exhibits this phenomenon; to set up a whole "subjunctive" mode for one optional respelling shows how far obcurantist grammarians are willing to go to make grammar unreasonable. When **if** is deleted, as in **Were he not ready now**, **was** *has to* be respelled as **were**; further, the subject then has to stand in inverted word order, i.e. after the auxiliary. Moreover, **-n't** has to be changed to **not** and placed after the subject. A constraint on English **if**-DELETION is that it may take place only when certain auxiliary verbs are present—**had**, **were**, **would**, **could**, and, with limitations, **did** (usually found with **but**, as in **Did they but know**).

Lack of space prohibits discussing all of the processual modalities of English. But a few more of them may be touched on. In archaizing solemn style, *optative* **may** is deletable with **be** and **come** and—in fossils out of the past—other verbs. Cf. **(May) God save the Queen!** and **(May) God have mercy!** The reader is reminded of the contrast between **She may win** and **May she win**, with *optative* **may** in the latter. DELETION of *optative* **may** is followed by SUBJECT-INVERSION (an *irrealis* processual modality also used for plain questions and for imperatives, hortatives, and jussives; see n. 10) if no object goes with the verb. The same inversion optionally takes place after **so** and sometimes other clause-initial adverbs; it *must* take place when such adverbs precede an ***e*** that stands for deleted *optative* **may**; e.g. **Long *e* live the Queen!** and **So *e* help me God!** In general, when no noun object follows the verb, inversion follows *optative*-**may**-DELETION; e.g. ***e* come the revolution** and ***e* be it ever so humble**. (We no longer delete *concessive* **may**: cf. **the best one, whichever it *may* be**.)

In current English, the former subjunctive has been replaced by **should**-DELETION, **may**-DELETION and the TEMPORAL THROW-BACK (with its accompanying, usually optional, respelling of **was** as **were**). The only subjunctive today is still partly nascent—the exochronous modality. (See the author's "*Irrealis* modalities and the misnamed 'present

simple tense' in English" [*Language & communication* 5 (1985), 297-314] and the *Middigrammar* [see n. 1].)

The deletion of **you** in imperatives is another *irrealis* processual modality; cf. ***e e* go**, where ***e e*** represent **you will.** (That **you will** are theoretically present in imperatives has been demonstrated by Paul Postal in "Underlying and superficial linguistic structure" in the *Harvard educational review* 34 [1964], 246-266.) Note SUBJECT-INVERSION in the prohibition, **Don't *e* go**—an imperative additionally marked by negation. Logical analysis takes the unmarked (expected) imperative to be formed by **you-will**-DELETION; the deleted pronoun is replaced, from the analytical point of view, by ***e***. Prohibitions can be "markered" by *not deleting* **you**; these "Dontchu" imperatives carry whatever marked or special connotations may be inferable from the circumstances; e.g. **Don'tchu dare!** (conveying a warning or threat) and **Don'tchu cry, Honey!** (conveying sympathy).

Readers are invited to seek out the clarifications of imperatives with undeleted **you** offered by their favorite grammar. I've never seen any mention in any grammar of the fact that when **you** remains undeleted in marked imperatives, **dare** is more often a modal verb; contrast **Don'tchu dare say that!** (when **to** is absent, **dare** is a modal verb) with **Don't dare to say that** (where non-modal **dare** has **to**).

If grammars even bother to deal with examples like **space available** and **person responsible**, they tend to mystify rather than clarify. Such examples are not intractable when one realizes that they parallel **space available *for that e*** and **a person responsible *for that e***: they obey the [A-X] N RULE rule that yields the attested noun-adjective order from "underlying" formats that are not allowed in English (unless the adjective phrase is hyphenated and treated as a single word): In this example, **available for that** [**purpose**] **space** and **responsible for that** [**accident**] **person** cannot, in good English, remain the way they are found in the basic or underlying representation—the one that has to be postulated if everything connected with this matter is to make systematic sense. Cf. **the debutante happy to've been invited**, from underlying **the happy to've been invited debutante**. To trigger the rule to create **space available** and **person responsible**, there has got to be something in the basic or underlying representation—an ***e*** (standing for "for that ***e***")—following the adjective and separating it from the following noun—the one being modified by the adjective in question. Analysed with ***e*** —i.e. as **space available *e*** and **person responsible *e***—the order problem simply dissipates: The exceptions and puzzles dissolve into nothing, and the intact nature of the coherent system appears transparent in form and meaning.

I won't burden the reader with the details of the [A-X] N RULE

which operates to create predicative adjective phrases following the nouns they modify; its exceptions are not minimal, though they are mostly structured in a reasonable way. (See the writer's "Attributive and predicative: form and order" [*Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 12 (1986), 147-154]. A reversal also puts the adjective after a pronoun; e.g. **nothing improbable.**) But the [A-X] N rule and its exceptions can't be looked up in your handy but not very helpful deskside grammar. That the meaning is taken care of in the analysis having ***e*** standing for recoverable "for that ***e***" is clear in **The space available *e* is less than the available space** and **That irresponsible person was the person responsible *e***: Though eminently logical in English, literal translations of these sentences into other languages yield gobbledygook—viz. patent contradictions.

If grammars are opaque with respect to the foregoing, what do they tell us about the differences illustrated in the anterior participles, **sunken : sunk**, **rotten : rotted** (cf. **swollen : swelled** and **molten : melted**), **burnt : burned**, and **agĕd : ag'd**? And so with the durative participles, **lab'ring** (with one syllable preceding the ending) : **laboring** (with two syllables preceding the ending), **lab'ling : labeling**, **foll'wing : following**, and **op'ning : opening**. In other words, what is the systematic principle governing all of these pairs of variants? If readers compare the following examples, they will see that the item on the left in each of the pairs exemplified is attributive (truly adjectival and standing before nouns modified), while the item on the right is predicative (verb-like, typically following the modified noun [it also forms part of compound verbs]):

sunken treasure : treasure sunk years ago in those deep waters
rotten apples : apples rotted by days of exposure to the sun
burnt toast : toast burned by leaving it in the oven too long
agĕd scholar : scholar ag'd by the keen competition of bright students
lab'ring people : people laboring under that illusion
lab'ling device : device labeling the new product
foll'wing page : page following their picture
op'ning prayer : prayer opening the meeting

Forms in **-ing** used as nouns—gerunds—are pronounced the same way as attributives, as in **lab'ring all day on that filing**, **a device for lab'ling the new product**, **that demagogue's foll'wing**, and **We found an op'ning**. A useful grammar would also discuss the difference between **incoming mail** and **mail coming in**.

For that matter, a grammar should take note of the difference in cultivated usage between the compared adverb, **quicker**, as in **She got there quicker than he did**, and **more quickly** in **the more-quickly available funds**. Indeed, a grammar should tell when **more quick** gets used in place of adjectival **quicker**; e.g. **more quick than slow** and usually **more**

ready to oppose anything new than to seek to understand it.

A grammar should minimally distinguish the uses of **wove** and **weaved** (in traffic), **shone** and **shined** (transitive; optionally, intransitive), **mice** and **mouses** (attached to computers), **geese** and **gooses** (the noun corresponding to the verb **goose**; and ***Mother Gooses***—i.e. books so titled), and the like. A good grammar would tell why these differences exist; and the explanation would lie in reversals for marked senses.

These comments only touch on the many things that grammars should do but usually don't do: The thing that they do succeed in doing is to waste students' time on profitless and boring chimeras.

It can be predicted without fear of contradiction that you won't find in your favorite grammar any hint (or any clarification) of the reversals that verb forms undergo in marked, or special, categories or environments in English. These can be first illustrated with the *surrealis* environment (which I'll bet is not in your grammar), without which several important and useful, indeed necessary, generalizations about the verb system can't be made. The environment in question is a dependent clause (other than a causal or quotatory clause) subordinated to a clause with a posterior predicate (including imperatives).[10] In this environment, **were to** plus a verb is counterexpectative (as in **If they *were to* arrive tomorrow**, . . .); but in other environments, it is expectative (as in **They *were to* arrive tomorrow**.) **Should** is doubtful or contingent in **We wanted to wait till she *should* arrive**, **We planned to greet only whoever *should* arrive first**, and **If she *should* arrive tomorrow**, . . . but *factual* in certain non-*surrealis* environments: **They were surprised and disgusted that he *should* arrive late for his own party.** (A doubtful or contingent present-posterior can even be expressed by a normal past or past-anterior in the *surrealis* environment; cf. **They'd be outraged if you *had built* it before they *arrived* there next month.**)

Speakers (even teachers) of many languages learning English are prone to use the wrong verb forms here, especially with temporal conjunctions (**when**, **while**, **once**, **until**, **as soon as**, **before**, **after**, etc.): They say, **I'll do it when** (or **as soon as**) **she *will* arrive** (with the unintended connotations pointed out in n. 11) when they should say neutral **when she *arrives***. The cause is ignorance of the *surrealis* environment. (Many foreigners also foul up the systematic but complicated difference between **by** and **until** when both are the same word in their own languages; see the writer's "*By* and *until*" in the present series.)

Note that although an imperative creates a *surrealis* environment, the **if** introducing an indirect question doesn't do so (unless, of course, the indirect question is dependent on a clause with a posterior predicate and is therefore itself in the *surrealis* environment); cf. **He's wondering**

if they'll be ready. Your grammar should tell you the difference between indirect questions introduced with **if** and those introduced with **whether**: The former type lacks (D. Bolinger, p.c.) the open choice of the latter, which often has **or not** appended; e.g. **She wondered whether to go or not**. Grammarians who reject **if** altogether in the rôle of introducing an indirect question are barking up the wrong tree.

Just as remarkable as the reversals in the *surrealis* environment already noted are the way the two most usual and least specific present-posteriors, **be going to** (mischaracterized by most grammarians) and **will**, switch around with each other in the *surrealis* environment and the way they switch with the exochronous modality there. Though the exochronous modality is marked with the special sense of a routine or scheduled event in **The ship arrives at eight tomorrow**, it becomes the neutral or expected (unmarked) modality in the *surrealis* environment; e.g. **If the ship arrives late**, . . . The use of posterior forms that are otherwise least marked turns this same hypothesis clause into a marked "acquiescing" one:[11] **If the train's *gonna* be late**, . . . ; cf. also **At three, when the bell'*ll be* ringin'**, . . . and **He'll give it to the one who'*ll* be designated to do it.**

Other marked environments that trigger reversals are negative contexts (including environments with **only**) and truly interrogative contexts (i.e. not rhetorical questions, etc.) as well as comparative constructs. In a negative environment, for example, non-modal **doesn't need to** and **doesn't dare to** may become modal verbs and take the **-n't** that is attached only to auxiliary verbs: **needn't** and **daren't** (plus the short infinitive). Contrast **She doesn't needa get upset by that** (neutral) with modal **She needn't get upset by that** (volitional: an advisory suggestion). These environments are the ones in which **could** can function as a true past rather than as a past-posterior. Knowing about this class of environments, foreigners can avoid saying **could** where the native-speaker says only **was** or **were able to**—a frequent error that even teachers are not free of.

With the foregoing in mind, we can better understand why **be gonna** and **will**—respectively neutral and representing a settled notion in plain environments—reverse their forces when found in questions and when negated. In unmarked contexts, we find examples like **I know that we'*ll* find out the answer** signaling a more settled notion than the neutral **We'*re gonna* find out the answer**. But contrast negative **We'*re* never *gonna* find out the answer**—more of a settled notion than neutral **We'*ll* never find out the answer**. Contrast also interrogative ***Are* we ever *gonna* find out the answer?**—more of a settled doubt than neutral ***Will* we ever find out the answer?** Compare further **How'*re* we *gonna* pay for it?**—far less neutral than **How'*ll* we pay for it?** Willi Mayerthaler's theory (see his *Morphologische Natürlichkeit* [1981; Athenaion]) of reversals in marked categories or environments (developed in the late seventies and early

eighties for the Romance languages) in effect predicts these phenomena in English. If these reversals are complex, they are none the less very systematic for anyone who has this up-to-date tool at their disposal.

Grammarians have failed not only in not understanding reversals in marked situations but also in confusing non-posterior **will** (one of five separate kinds of **will** in English, three being non-posteriors) with the **will** they purport to be investigating and in contrasting it with **be gonna**. So we find examples like **Anyone who'll do that'll do anything**, where the characterizing use of **will** is found, pointlessly compared with **Anyone who's gonna do that'll do anything**. The settled-notion force of posterior **will** outside of the *surrealis* environment makes it the unmarked expectation in the contingency clause of a conditional sentence; e.g. **If they're late, we'll be disappointed**—or, with negation triggering a reversal of passive force: **If they're late, we're not gonna be disappointed**.

For readers perplexed by the **get**-passive, grammarians have nothing to offer beyond the confusion that arises out of their own failure to recognize that the aspectualities of the **be** and **get**-passives get reversed in marked temporal categories and in marked contexts (also unknown to them). In unmarked past and present indicatives, the **get**-passive (as in **They got questioned**) has non-processual (i.e. resultative or reportive) aspectuality; and the **be**-passive (as in **They were [being] questioned about the latest break-in**) has processual aspectuality—conveying not *what* but *how*.[12] In the marked temporal categories, exemplified in present-anterior **They've been questioned about it**, the **be**-passive conveys a result or a mere report (one would hardly say, **They've been being questioned**), whereas **They've been getting questioned about it** has a processual **get**-passive.

It's no wonder that grammarians without adequate tools find these phenomena so inexplicable; all they can do is either wave their hands at them or ignore them altogether. It may be worth mentioning in passing that English-speakers often hold the unsubstantiated belief that the **get**-passive is slangy and stylistically unsuitable for writing. (In one study, two speakers who denied that they *ever* used the **get**-passive actually used it in a place where the other informants did not! This illustrates what William Labov calls the OBSERVER'S PARADOX: When we monitor our own speech, there is no way of finding out what we say in unmonitored speech.) The theory of reversals in marked contexts correctly predicts and explains the opposed aspectualities aspectualities of the two passives in marked categories and environments. (Parallel predictions concern causative **have** and **get**; but these can't be illustrated here.)

To recur to the passives, compare (marked) exochronous **One item is**

explained (or **lost**) (resultative or simply reportive) with **One item gets explained** (or **lost**) **by them every day** (processual); and contrast the latter with a true (processual) present: **One item is being explained now**. With present-anterior **She's been talked about** (resultative or reportive) compare **She's been getting** (not **been being!**) **talked about a lot** (processual); and contrast these with true pasts like **She got talked about** (resultative or reportive) and **She was (being) talked about a lot by everybody at the party** (processual). An example with a modal verb is **It can be looked into** (non-processual): **It can get looked into some day** (processual). Clearly, the aspectualities of the passives are reversed in marked and unmarked temporal categories. (The situation is more complex with posteriors because some of the nine posterior modalities are unmarked uses and others are marked.) We find double reversals where marked categories are found in marked environments: Double reversals end up non-reversed.

If the past processual passive is **They were being married**, why do we feel that processual **They were getting married** also sounds all right? A proper analysis should clarify this, and the one under discussion does so. It predicts that—and makes clear why—**They were getting married** can be used processually: It is a (marked) past-posterior; one could appropriately add: **on the following day**.

Reversals are not limited to verbs (and I've ignored what happens to passives with negated and interrogated modal verbs as well as the differences between what is found with past-habitual **would** and **useta**). It has been seen that that predicative adjectives generally follow the nouns they modify, reversing the order of attributives, which precede; and that adjectives follow pronouns. Another example of reversal that may shed additional light on the subject for the reader is the obligatory inversion of the order of the subject and finite verb following a clause-initial restrictive negative expression (including **only**); e.g. **Not for all o' the tea in China would she invite that person to her place!** Compare **For only a little could you buy that house** (with a restrictive **only**-phrase) with **For only a little, you could buy that house** (a type of example suggested by Ian Trotter). The reversal in the former is not only marked for special focus but also markered in form: **Never did they want to go back** is obligatorily markered by **did**, although **never** doesn't otherwise require this auxiliary; cf. **They never wanted to go back**. In either order, **did** creates a kind of emphasis.

Failure to understand the system is particularly salient in the analysis of conditional sentences in the grammars (see n. 11 for future conditionals). Such a lack of systematic thinking makes one wonder . . . or would do so if it weren't clear that much of the trouble lies in a failure to understand the reversing rôle of the very marked *surrealis* environment

and to recognize processuality in grammar—not only reversals in marked contexts but (*irrealis*) processual modalities and other processes.

Till now, no mention has been made of other sophisticated tools that are suitable for advanced grammars—but not always for school grammars. A couple of these will be mentioned simply to acquaint the reader with what is on offer in current analysis, viz. the Chomskian concepts of RAISING (newer names are used in the current work of Chomsky's school for this and related kinds of *movement*) and ***control***. In **Who does Joe appear to've been hurt by?** the word **who** in underlying [*e* [*e* **appear** [**Joe to have been hurt by who**]]]? has been moved to fill the first empty spot, and **Joe** has been moved up to the subject position before **appear**. Finally, "dummy" **does** has been inserted before **Joe** to make acceptable English. The result is [**Who** [**does Joe appear** [*e* **to have been hurt by** *e*]]]? (Note the empty forms that result from a word's being moved away from a given position. The Romance languages have got similar "raising" movements; German differs from these languages and from English in this respect and in respect to other complicated syntactic phenomena.) One matter that has preoccupied syntacticians has been to explain why we can say, **the one who I thought (that) we'd met**—with or without the word **that**—since *subject* **that** is not allowed in **the one who I thought** *e* **was lucky**. The phenomenon, at least, should be mentioned in practical grammars, even though the explanation will be considered beyond their scope.

The deletion of the subject of an infinitive when it is the same as the subject of the main verb falls under ***control***. Speakers of German and other languages can say the equivalent of **I believed** *e* **to be able to do that** (where *e* = **myself**), but English (like Latin) cannot delete the repeated subject with **believe**. English can delete the subject of an infinitive when it has the same reference as the subject of many verbs that the infinitive can complement; e.g. **She wants** *e* **to leave**. When the subject of the infinitive is different from that of the main verb, as in **She wants *them* to leave**, it is of course not deleted. It has been observed earlier that the subject of an infinitive is often preceded by **for**. Chomsky has pointed out that **want** (extrasystematically) lacks the same **for** as a marker of the subject of the dependent infinitive whenever nothing separates **want** from the infinitive construct, as in the preceding example; but **for** *is* found in **I want very much *for them* to leave** and in **What I want is *for them* to leave**. This information should find a place even in school grammars (of any pretensions).

The reader may wonder whether grammatical correctness derives from the way fashionable speakers (they are the young in Anglo-Keltic culture) speak or from revelations received on a private line that gives grammarians alone access to the *penetralia* of wisdom concerning language. While all sensible native-speakers *behave* in accordance with the first alternative (though there are teachers who try to speak like books), most non-linguists *speak* as though they believed that correctness objectively exists out there somewhere—perhaps in divine hands—and as though grammarians were somehow in possession of Delphic lore which is not available to others—which those lacking access to hidden wisdom are to accept on being informed of the alleged facts by those who've been initiated into the mysteries. (Some grammarians might not take it at all askance if you thought their references to "standard" English indicated private access to arcane sources of knowledge! It's too bad that their actual products belie any such claims.)

It is true of many cultures that languages *are* standardized by educational or other government authorities, who require this monostylistic formal standard (not anyone's native speech, as often as not) to be studied by every school student and to be used for certain purposes. The dictionaries produced or commissioned by these authorities are by definition error-free, except for typographical errors, since they legally define the language in question—which is basic to what "standardization" is. This gives an indication of why people from such countries have fits with the Anglo-Keltic view of language; e.g. the fact that our governments can't adjudicate what is correct or require a given form of the language to be learned in the schools. The DICTIONARY SUPERSTITION of such foreigners, belief in the infallibility of dictionaries, won't allow them to admit what is true: that English dictionaries are replete with errors—inevitably so because our dictionaries can't define: They seek to record what happens. Fashion dictates what is good English; and you can pick a disk jockey or popular comedian or any other model you wish, so long as the model is not unyouthful. Since it is older language-users that set the language fashions and standards in most non-Anglo-Keltic countries, few teachers in those other cultures are ever able to come to grips with the native-speaker's view of English.

Teachers both native and foreign need to be encouraged to abandon the static view of language and should be given help in order to do so. What sort of reaction should meet a new formation like **obsess over**, which I heard on the media just as I was writing this? Instead of a knee-jerk reaction against what is new, why not look at the item to see if it fulfills a need in an adequate manner? The classicist might prefer **obside** (cf. **subside**) to **obsess**, **accede** (cf. **precede**) to the verb **access**, and **aggrede**

to the verb **aggress** (usually followed by **against**); but how many ordinary users of English would understand the "more authentic" but opaque formations? Anyhow, there is acceptable precedent for **obsess** as a verb, not only in general principles for deriving new forms but also in concrete examples like the denominative verbs (verbs derived from nouns), **process** (as in **process foods** or "take part in a procession"; contrast **proceed**), **discuss**, and **regress**. There's a good argument for the denominative transitive verb, **access**, in computer usage (where **mouses** is the proper plural of **mouse**, as noted earlier): **accede** already exists as an intransitive verb in another sense. In using **obsess over**, the speaker evidently felt a need for the innovation. This adequate term, perhaps coined on the model of **agonize over**, meets the need with some style. So why reject it? Let's add it to the creative riches of our language!

Objections to **disassociate** (for **dissociate**, which the writer generally uses) would also rule out **disaffected**, **disallusioned**, **disappointed**, and **disapproved**—which the arbiters of usage apparently fail to think about.

If you asked a grammarian or teacher *why* a split infinitive could be assumed to be wrong, they would either not know or else say that **to** should directly precede the infinitive form so that it wouldn't be separated from its marker. Unfortunately for this view, that reasoning also makes examples like **has *already* left** and **was *still being* observed** just as bad English as **to *still* observe** is claimed to be. Taking the grammarians' advice and changing **useta still observe** to **used still to observe** is the *reductio ad absurdum* of that advice; **still useta observe** sounds best of all.

In the days when one studied Latin in school, ***tense***, ***voice***, and ***mode*** were at least intelligible concepts. This is obviously no longer true today. If today's intelligent and creative students are to have any confidence that learning English grammar is a meaningful and worthwhile enterprise, the inadequacies of grammatical instruction (only sampled in this writing) will have to be attended to first. Only when the analyses found in current grammars are remedied with adequate analyses can the goals envisioned by the advocates of increased grammar-teaching be realized.

The fact that so many incorrect views about English and its history find their way into books being published today, and the fact that discredited notions and models are adopted with no hint of their problematic status, constitute an avoidable scandal. The origins of English get especially distorted in the texts and as a rule are at odds with the latest scholarship; and the daughter languages of English are unknown to most authors. That notions which are discredited can get taught by professionals is deplorable and ultimately inexcusable. Until all of that is changed, what justification can there be for *teaching more of the same?*

The writer would suggest the following test. Equally competent teachers, two biased in favor of current "grammar" and two biased in favor of the approach advocated in these pages, would teach native-speaking first-year high-school students for a year and first-year university students for a semester; each teacher would teach at the level best suited to their temperament and according to the analysis they favored. I have no doubt that the analysis proposed here would permit a teacher to cover more ground than working with past approaches, would yield a better understanding of the systematicity of grammar, and would therefore generate both greater *rapport* between taught and teacher (at least in the English-speaking world) and greater sympathy for the subject. A rational system is bound to yield better results than irrationality and non-system. For one thing, it doesn't scare students and turn them off the way current "grammar" does.

APPENDIX

The English ***modal verbs*** are **will**, **would**, **can**, **could**, **may**, **might**, **must**, **should**, **ought (to)**, and the now rare **shall**. See below on the two *transvestite* modals—**need** and **dare**. The forms and grammatical usages of modal verbs differ in several important ways from those of non-modal verbs—e.g. modals are uninflected—as grammars are obligated to show in terms of an intelligible system. Modal verbs express modal or unreal (*irrealis*) situations: those that are not (yet) existent, viz. futuritive—willed or forbidden, viewed as possible—or imagined, questioned, warned against, negated, denied, and so on. Modal **need** and **dare** convey modal overtones, viz. volitional force: advice or warning. Contrast **needn't** (and obsolescent **daren't**) with **doesn't need to** (and **doesn't dare to**), and note the advisory *vs.* neutral thrust of the respective variants. Contrast negated modal **needn't** with **doesn't** before *non*-modal **need**. Another syntactic difference is that the modal takes a short infintive (i.e. without **to**).

Verbids are verb forms functioning as nouns (gerunds), adjectives (participles), and adverbs; infinitives can be any of the three. English possesses ***durative*** or **-ing** participles and ***anterior*** participles (whose forms are illustrated in **floated**, **slept** or **bent**, **sunken**, and **sunk**).

This writing uses the term ***aspectuality*** instead of the usual term, ***aspect***, in order to avoid certain terminological questions requiring no discussion here. Also found in this writing is the term ***modality***, used to avoid the ***tense***, ***mode***, and ***voice*** format of grammars alien to English. English ***modalities*** are, in addition to a few inflected instances, either processual or periphrastic—i.e. constituted out of an auxiliary (like **get**) plus a verbid; cf. **get torn up** (passive), **get going** (inceptive), and **get to go** (opportunitive or, in some instances, inceptive). English has a large number of periphrastic modalities with all sorts of connotations. Not only are these simple to understand and more typical of the modalities of the English verb than the inflected type; they can be chained together in overlapping fashion so that the verbid of a preceding pair serves as the auxiliary of the next; e.g. **must've been going to've been getting torn up**—is this a "tense"? Some of the seven processual modalities are discussed in the text. Lastly, ***force*** is attitudinal—deontic intention, epistemic certainty, etc.

A word or two on ***marked*** and ***markered*** won't be amiss here. What is ***marked*** is somehow special—informally less expected, but technically what implies the existence of forms that are (therefore) less marked. What is ***markered*** has greater perceptible form than what isn't; thus, the ending **-s** makes **gives** more markered than **give**. The different concepts must be understood and not confused.

NOTES

[1]This and other topics treated here are detailed in the writer's *Middigrammar of currently fashionable English* (a revised version of an earlier *Minigrammar*; it is to appear in this series); reference is made there to other publications on particular subjects.

[2]**Hwām**, from which **whom** derives, was the *dative* form of the interrogative (not relative) pronoun in Anglo-Saxon—it wasn't an accusative! The grammarians knew, however, that the Latin accusative ended in **-m**. That the Greek accusative ended in **-n**, almost like Anglo-Saxon **hwone**, evidently carried little weight among the grammarians of the period.

[3]Degrees of markedness can be exactly characterized in terms of historical developments not affected by the sort of sociocommunicational phenomena (borrowing, overcorrection, and other developments familiar to linguists) that interfere with natural change—something that can also be precisely characterized and accounted for in a dynamic framework (cf. the writer's forthcoming *Essays on time-based linguistic analysis* [Oxford University Press]). Provided certain common misunderstandings are avoided, the order in which infants acquire different items in their native languages provides evidence for markedness. Naturally, these matters are too technical to go into here; and that is unnecessary.

[4]**Hafta** and **'ve gotta** (cf. n. 6) are non-modals that are often deontic.

[5]On the other hand, deontic **must** is polite when directed toward those we are treating with deference and can't possibly command; e.g. **You must try some of this! May** would be rude to superiors or equals, since we can't give permission to those we cannot command; so we say to our equals, **You should** or **You'll hafta try some** of this!

[6]**Hafta** and its variant **hasta** show the same sound changes of **v** to **f** and of **z** to **s**—both before **t**—which are exhibited in **left** and **lost**, respectively from **leave** and **lose**. **Hadda** is the past variant.

[7]The ***e*** or empty form is explained in the third section. Here, it represents displaced **what?** (Cf. undisplaced **what?** in echo and reclamatory questions having a rising intonational pattern like **She's got *what*?**) The empty form does not explain the phenomenon, since the example without it (viz. **be supposed to**) contains no ***e*** in the variant on the left. **Wanna : want *e* to** partially fit the picture of the examples given here; cf. **Which one did they wanna win?** (cf. **They wanted to win which one?**) and **Which one did they want *e* to win?** (cf. **They wanted *which one* to win?**). But the facts with **wanna** are considerably more complex, and the

analysis is much argued over.

[8]Note also the use of **now** with other similarly marked temporal categories—e.g. present-anterior **It's now been taken care of** and exochronous **It leaks now** and **It's okay now**. With exochronous forms, **now** generally means "by now" or "nowadays." Compare also **now** with imperatives and modal verbs, both marked categories (modals have posterior or exochronous temporality); e.g. **Go now** and **We must leave now**.

[9]I write "gonna" because **going to** has a literal sense lacking here. For past-posterior time, **was/were be gonna** is unmarked in a main clause, but **would** is unmarked in a dependent clause. Similar differences characterize **let's : let us** and **lemme : let me**. (Other shortenings or coalescences that create semantic differences have been discussed in the first section.) An adequate grammar should discuss these matters, along with the nine posteriors and the four **let**s and **may**s of English; its five **will**s, **would**s, and **should**s; and the many **get**s, along with the inceptive and opportunitive **get to** modalities illustrated in **He got to like her** and **She finally got to attend**, respectively. (See the writer's *Middigrammar* for details.)

[10]With imperatives go hortatives like **Let's eat what seems easiest to prepare** and jussives like **Let them eat when I'm ready.** Purposive (adverbial) infinitives and infinitives complementing volitional verbs (indicating desire, intention, etc.) also create *surrealis* dependencies; e.g. **They're waiting to cheer whoever wins** and **I want to cheer whoever wins**. The negative form of **let's** is **Don't let's** or **Let's don't**, one of which is old enough to've been used by Samuel Johnson; **let's not** is a formal variant.

[11]As the writer has pointed out in various publications (e.g. "Classifying the English conditionals" [*American speech* 64 (1989), 275-280], English can express present-posterior hypothesis clauses with varying degrees of certainty/uncertainty. Note that since what is yet to come is naturally uncertain, the more certain we are of what the future will or will not bring, the more marked the corresponding statement will be.

Accepted as true:	**If it'll be on time, we'll be late.**
Neutral:	**If it's on time, we'll be late.**
Doubtful:	**If it should be** (or **were**) **on time tomorrow, we wouldn't be able to get there in time to meet it.**
Counterexpectative:	**If it were to be late, we could make it.**

The first example (it has a complex syntactic derivation) acquiesces in the truth of the hypothesis; in such examples, **If** (really **if *e***) is more or less equivalent to **If it is granted that** or the like. Similar differences are found in temporal and relative clauses, but they may be somewhat less

clear-cut than in hypothesis clauses. But cf. **They'd laugh at anybody that *came* up with anything that improbable**; **We knew that, until they *came* up with something new, it would be as boring as before**; and **We'd refuse to agree as soon as they *began* to pressure us**. Cf. also **Though I should walk in the valley of the shadow of death, . . .** and **I'll say so to anyone who should challenge the vote**, as well as **He would continue to hope as long there were something to hope for** and **I wouldn't vote for any that were to act so ridiculous as to be in favor of that sort of thing**.

[11]The processual difference between the two passives was first suggested to me by D. Bolinger (p.c.), though I don't think he used this term. Some grammarians have claimed, on the basis of examples like **Get lost!**, that the **get**-passive expresses intentional force. That this is not true is easily seen in **She cried when her dress *got rained on***. **Get *e* lost** (with deleted **yourself**) is what is technically called the ***contraponent*** form or use (active in form, passive in sense) of causal **get**. (Being causal in origin, it therefore expresses an intention; cf. **She got *e* arrested in order to get some publicity out of the thing**). This analysis means that **Get *e* lost** is to **get yourself lost** what **The door opened *e*** is to **The door was opened** (or less English-like **The door opened itself**). Any imperative is marked. Among the peculiarities of imperatives is that they also can combine **do** with a progressive verb form (e.g. **Do be studying when they arrive**); and passive imperatives occur only when negated. (**Be informed** has copular **be**; **informed** is a predicate adjective here. Similarly, **Get informed** has copular **get** in the sense of "become.")

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Universitätsprofessor-*emeritus* Dr. Dr. Charles-James N. Bailey held a chair for English and general linguistics at the Technische Universität Berlin for seventeen years before retiring. He received his undergraduate degree at Harvard with highest honors in classical philology and did graduate studies at Cambridge University, Vanderbilt, the University of Chicago, and other universities in Switzerland, Italy, and especially North America. Bailey has been guest professor in several countries of Africa and Asia. He is a corresponding member of the Académie Européenne des Sciences, des Arts et des Lettres and a life fellow of the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences. His book, *Essays on time-based linguistic analysis*, is to appear from Oxford University Press next year.

CORRIGENDA

P. 6, end of line 15 up, following **languages**, delete:)

P. 13, l. 14, for **dont**, read: don't

P. 13, l. 15 up, the example is less apt than this one:

That she won has happened : It has happened that she won.

P. 15, l. 6 up, following **plural of**, read: a countable noun,

P. 19, l. 9 up, for **(for**, read: (often for

P. 22, l. 5, for **as in**, read: cf. also

P. 27, l. 14, for **passive force**, read: passive aspectuality

P. 29, two examples (both correct) would be improved if changed thus:

1: ll. 9, 10, 12, 13, for **appear**, read: **happen**

2: l. 2 up, reorder example to: **For them to leave is what I want.**

P. 33, l. 14 up, for words in parentheses, read instead: (see n. 9)

Additional comment on exx. on p. 28, ll. 8-9, viz. **It can *be* looked into** (non-processual) and **It can *get* looked into some day** (processual). These exx. are complicated, since the theory could be interpreted to predict a double reversal (one for the modal verb; one for the infinitive) here; yet, **You can *be* shot for that** does indeed seem non-processual, while **You can *be getting* aimed at by these tactics** is clearly processual. On the other hand, with more-marked *could*, we have: **You could *get* shot** (or **arrested**) **for that** is reportive; and **You could *be* severely punished for that**, **It might *be being* used for other ends**, and **She could *be being* followed** all seem clearly processual. A detailed clarification is forthcoming in "What grammarians haven't been doing right: unriddling analytical paradoxes" (in *Essays on time-based linguistic analysis*; 1993, OUP).

Linguistics series ISBN 1-881309-02-9

1 ***Variation in the data: can linguistics ever become a science?***

Ch.-J. N. Bailey—ISBN 1-881309-03-7

(ca. 160 pp.; $4.60 stitched, including surface post; available 4/92)

2 ***Workbooks for English transcriptional phonetics*** (rev.):
2a. ***Syllabus of exercises for Southern States English***
2b. ***Syllabus of exercises for Southern British English***

Ch.-J. N. Bailey

□

Grammar Series ISBN 1-881309-00-2

1 ***Why more English instruction won't mean better grammar***

Ch.-J. N. Bailey—ISBN 1-881309-01-0

(ca. 35 pp., $2.60 stitched, including surface post; available 4/92)

2 "Education and English grammar: misconceptions and reality"
and "***By*** and ***until***"

Ch.-J. N. Bailey

3 ***Reference creole minigrammars***

3a. ***Krio***, by Frederick C. V. Jones
3b. ***Bislama***, by Ch.-J. N. Bailey
with 3c. "Not modal *f3*, not TMA, not infinitizer ***go***," by Ch.-J. N. Bailey

4 ***Middigrammar of currently fashionable English***

Ch.-J. N. Bailey

5 Public lecture: "New pieces in the puzzle: How linguists have been making grammar simpler despite the accumulation of more and more complex details"
with "Intonation as a system"

Ch.-J. N. Bailey

6 Three Appendixes on the English verb omitted from
What grammarians haven't been doing right:
or Unriddling analytical puzzles

Ch.-J. N. Bailey

Orchid Land Publications
Kea'au, HI 96749-1416, USA
FAX 1+808+982-5603

ISBN 1-881309-01-0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE